

CONFIDENTIAL

CA1

Z3

68L17C

TITLE: PUBLIC OPINION AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

AUTHOR: Professor R. R. March,
Department of Political Science,
University College,
McMaster University,
HAMILTON, Ontario.

Canada

DRAFT STUDY

prepared for

TASK FORCE ON LABOUR RELATIONS
(Privy Council Office)

PROJECT NO. 14

Submitted: JULY 1968

2. Introduction

This draft study is deposited for library use
with the compliments of the author but must not be
quoted without his written permission.

CONFIDENTIAL

TITLE: PUBLIC OPINION AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

AUTHOR: Professor R. R. March,
Department of Political Science,
University College,
McMaster University,
HAMILTON, Ontario.

DRAFT STUDY

prepared for

TASK FORCE ON LABOUR RELATIONS
(Privy Council Office)

PROJECT NO. 14

Submitted: JULY 1968

This draft study is deposited for library use
with the compliments of the author but must not be
quoted without his written permission.



Table of Contents


- I. Resume
- II. Text
- III. Appendix. Computer Tabulations of
CIPO Questions

Resume

This survey of Canadian public opinion on labour's role in the economy indicates that the structure of public opinion is rather complex. The public is, in principle, in favour of trade unions. The public, however, is against "closed shops". The public regards labour leaders with some degree of distrust, and this distrust has increased sharply in the last decade. Again, the public is upset by "agitation" and picketing activities of unions, and prefers some form of bargaining. Government activity as a mediator of disputes is generally approved as a means of settling disputes. There is also a climate of opinion which supports greater legislative control over labour activity.

In part, this general climate of distrust of traditional modes of labour activity (strikes, hard bargaining, sympathy picketing, etc) is contradicted by a wide degree of support for the objects of labour demands such as higher wages, pensions, and, especially, job security. In contrast, the public does not support a reduced work week, although there is some support for a guaranteed annual wage.

Finally, the public is concerned about inflation, but it apportions blame for inflation equally to combines of business and unions. In addition, the public supports greater control over government expenditures because it feels that these contribute to inflation.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761119711802>

INTRODUCTION

It is not the intention of this study to examine how and why Canadians formulate and express their attitudes toward labour. Nor can we examine here the process of the formation of public opinion, the nature of its expression, and its impact on public policy. To do so would be to violate the validity of the survey research data collected by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion. We cannot generalize to the extent of proffering explanations, but must limit ourselves to a description of what public opinion is. In order to go beyond description it would be necessary to use an experimental design by which specific hypotheses would be tested. Anything else would be a violation of the social science technique of retrospective description.

The Toronto Daily Star (November 8, 1961) contains the only detailed summary of the CIPO sampling technique. According to the article the Institute used, in 1961, a force of 600 part-time interviewers. All are women, and the average cost per study was between \$4,000 and \$5,000. The normal sample is 690 persons, but larger samples are drawn for pre-election surveys. The Institute claims that it used an area-probability sample with a margin of error of plus or minus three per cent. However, the rural portion of the sample is probably based on a crude area quota basis. For the urban areas, urban census tracts are stratified in accordance with income and a random sample of census tracts. The interviewers are then given a

quota to be interviewed and are permitted, after a random start to interview adults in every second dwelling. When the interviews are returned the data are processed by weighting for age by duplicating cards for those age groups under-sampled. Because of limitations on call-backs, the samples are probably biased against men, employed females, and low income groups. It is impossible to estimate the effects of this bias.

In addition to opinion on a variety of matters of a foreign or domestic nature, interviewers obtain a standard set of information about the age, sex, education, occupation, mother tongue, trade union characteristics, and residence of the respondents. Finally, the socio-economic status of each respondent is determined by the interviewer in accordance with a standard four point "home and standard of living" scale.

The basic approach which will be used in this study of Canadian attitudes toward Industrial Relations, will be to examine this opinion to see if there are basic differences between regions, union and non-union adults, and socio-economic groups. Where possible, an attempt will be made to investigate trends over time. The basic consideration will be the determination of the degree of cohesiveness of public opinion with respect to Industrial Relations. Are differences a function of social class, geographic region, or membership in a union?

First of all, we must ask what is the attitude toward labour unions in general? Then we will investigate specific actions of unions and employers. To begin with, it appears that the Canadian public has a vague feeling that unions are, in principle, a "good thing." It is only when specific union activities are discussed that a discrepancy appears. For example, In October, 1956, 70% of those sampled thought that labour unions have been a "good thing" for Canada, and only 12% thought they had been a "bad thing" (CIP0 252, N = 2040). The same level of support, in principle, for labour unions was indicated again in September, 1961, when 66% approved of labour unions and only 23% disapproved (CIP0 291, September, 1961, N = 676). As is to be expected, union members granted substantially more support for unions than did non-union members (85% to 70%). But the 15% difference is not as large as one might expect. (See Table Ia). Nor is there a substantial

difference between various socio-economic groups.

Table 1a

LABOUR UNIONS CIPO 291 (Sept. 1961)

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	85.4	14.6	158
Non Union member	70.4	29.6	443

LABOUR UNIONS

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	80.8	19.2	26
Ave.+	65.6	34.4	131
Ave.	77.7	22.3	363
Poor	71.6	28.4	81

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.E.I	75.7	24.3	37
N.S.	80.0	20.0	5
N.B.	100.0	00.0	10
Que.	83.2	16.8	167
Ont.	66.8	33.2	211
Man.	74.2	25.8	31
Sask.	89.3	10.7	28
Alta.	48.6	51.4	35
N.C.	79.7	20.3	69

The regional variations for approval of unions are fascinating. Support for unions was lowest in Alberta (49%), rather low in Ontario (67%), and exceptionally high in Quebec (83%), Saskatchewan (89%) and New Brunswick (100%: note a sample of only 10). These strong variations in support for the principle of unions underscore the significance of regional variations in Canada, and the relative weakness of social class as a determinant of public opinion. (R.Alford, Party and Society, Rand McNally & Co., Chicago, 1963, pp. 250 - 284.).

Although the principle of the existence of unions is not seriously questioned in Canada, the right to organize in unions could be another matter. However, it appears that there is even greater support for the abstract principle of the "right" to organize in unions, as opposed to the vague acceptance of the right for unions to exist. We shall see later that the translation of the vague principles of union existence and the "right" to organize in a union into coercion of workers into unions is another matter.

But let us return to our examination of the principle of organizing a union. The "right" to organize a union is not seriously questioned, in principle, for in September, 1959, (CIPQ 278, N = 694) 81.8% of those sampled supported the right of workers to organize into unions, only 7.6% opposed this right, while 10.5% were undecided.

Again, as we can see from the data presented in the

Tables below, there are no significant differences between union and non-union members concerning the "right" to organize in unions. Union members who replied answered Yes 95%, while non-union supported the principle by 90%.

Table 2CIPO 278RIGHT TO ORGANIZE IN UNIONS

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.E.I.	91.7	8.3	24
N.S.	77.8	22.2	9
N.B.	88.2	11.8	17
Que.	92.0	8.0	162
Ont.	93.9	6.1	214
Man.	89.2	10.8	37
Sask.	83.3	16.7	30
Alta.	87.5	12.5	48
B.C.	95.7	4.3	69
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	95.1	4.9	184
Non Union member	90.1	9.9	436
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	94.4	5.6	18
Ave.+	91.5	8.5	141
Ave.	91.7	8.3	384
	90.9	9.1	77

Given such levels of support, it is doubtful whether the question of the right to organize in unions [like motherhood], is open to question in Canada. However, we shall see that certain activities of unions are divisive. This is especially true when the element of coercion is examined. That is, the public, while generally well disposed towards unionism, does not support compulsory features of union tactics. For example, a sample of Canadians was asked on July 28, 1954, whether an employer should be able to hire anyone whether or not the worker belonged to any union (CIP0 237, N = 1860). Only 15.5% supported the statement that he must belong to a union, whereas 72.8% said that employers have the right to hire anyone. The Canadian public in 1954 certainly opposed the idea of a "closed shop." The data are presented below.

Table 3
CIP0 237

SHOULD EMPLOYER BE FORCED TO HIRE UNION MEMBERS

	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	63.3	36.7	392
Non Union member	89.4	10.6	1175
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	81.2	18.7	96
Ave. +	87.9	12.1	240
Ave.	84.2	15.8	613
Poor +	80.2	19.8	434
Poor	79.9	20.1	204

Table 3CIPO 237SHOULD EMPLOYER BE FORCED TO HIRE UNION MEMBERS

	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.E.I.	90.0	10.0	10
N.S.	83.3	16.7	48
N.B.	79.2	20.8	24
Que.	78.5	21.5	446
Ont.	85.3	14.7	505
Man.	87.3	12.7	110
Sask	85.6	14.4	111
Alta.	90.2	9.8	123
B.C.	79.1	20.9	172

Union and non-union members are sharply divided on this issue of coercion, with 63% of union members opposed to the requirement that an individual must belong to a union, compared to 90% of non-union respondents. The differences were even sharper among those in favour of a closed shop. Only 37% of union members supported a closed shop, while 11% of non-union members were opposed. If we control for size, the ratio of support for a closed shop between union and non-union members is of the order of nine to one.

Finally, on this question of a closed shop, there are no very large regional differences, or differences among social classes. It would appear then, that the support for a closed

shop is a union artifact, or a part of union psychology. Still, the fact that only 37% of union members support the concept indicates that the unions have not sold their members on this idea.

Another facet of the structure of public opinion on unions is the rather strong shift since 1954 toward increasing criticism of labour leaders. In 1954 (see Table below), more of those sampled thought that organized labour is wisely led (37.5%) than those who thought it was unwisely led (33.7%). Twenty seven decimal nine percent were undecided. In 1957, the difference were similar, with slightly more opting for "wisely led" than "unwisely led," but the undecided element increased sharply from 27.9% to 38.0%. By February, 1964, the the proportion of critical respondents increased sharply, and in June, 1966, and August, 1966, increased sharply again to 44% (rounded). The undecided element has dropped, but still remains significantly large.

Table 4

IS ORGANIZED LABOUR
WISLEY OR UNWISELY LED BY ITS LEADERS?

	March 3 1954 CIP0 <u>235</u>	March 1957 CIP0 <u>256</u>	Feb. 1964 CIP0 <u>306</u>	June 1966 CIP0 <u>319</u>	Aug. 1966 CIP0 <u>320</u>
Wisely	37.5	32.4	38.2	29.2	28.4
Unwisely	33.7	28.4	39.5	44.1	43.7
Undecided	27.9	38.0	22.3	26.5	27.7
	N=1861	N=2109	N=694	N=671	N=732

As would be expected, union members were much less likely to criticize union leadership. For example, in 1957 71% of union members thought that unions were wisely led, but by 1964 there was a remarkable shift in the opinion of union members, for in 1964 only 25% of union members approved of union leaders, while 75% disapproved! In fact non-union members were more favourably disposed to union leaders than were union members themselves. Two years later, in 1966, there was a shift back to the more normal pattern of support for union leaders, but even so, a slight majority of union members still disapproved of union leadership (52% opposed, 48% in favour). Non-union members continued to disapprove of union leaders. (A ratio of two to one).

It is apparent, then, that although the general public approves of unions, their dislikes are concentrated on union leaders. Moreover, union members themselves have become very critical of their own leaders. It may be that much industrial unrest is the result of poor leadership by union officers.

Usually, the question concerning the degree of wisdom of union leaders was coupled with a request to provide specific criticisms of unions if they had any. Some two-thirds of union members would offer no criticism while only one-third of non-union members refused to proffer criticism. The specific criticisms are presented below in Table 5.

Table 5

CIPO 256

MAIN CRITICISM OF UNIONS

	No Criticism	Dictorial Leadership	Abuse Too Power Strong	Act too Quickly	Too Prone to Strike	Comm- unistic	American Domination	Demand too Much	Total
Union member	64.0	4.7	1.9	6.2	0.8	8.1	0.4	4.3	9.7
Non Union member	34.2	9.6	2.4	12.1	0.6	14.1	3.9	1.8	20.7
									258
									622

	No Criticism	Dictorial Leadership	Abuse Too Power Strong	Act too Quickly	Too Prone to Strike	Comm- unistic	American Domination	Demand too Much	Total
Wealthy	100.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	6
Ave+	34.3	0.6	2.0	13.5	0.8	13.5	2.4	0.8	24.1
Ave.	44.2	9.8	2.2	10.0	0.8	12.4	3.4	2.6	14.7
Poor	53.2	1.6	2.4	8.9	00.0	11.3	1.6	5.6	15.3

	No C Criticism	Dictorial Leadership	Abuse Too Power Strong	Act too Quickly	Too Prone to Strike	Comm- unistic	American Domination	Demand too Much	Total
P.E.I.	37.5	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	37.5	00.0	25.0	16
N.S.	40.0	5.7	17.1	00.0	00.0	11.4	00.0	14.3	35
N.B.	48.6	11.4	20.0	00.0	00.0	17.1	00.0	2.9	35
Que.	77.8	00.0	3.0	1.5	1.5	5.9	00.0	8.9	135
Ont.	37.1	10.8	7.4	0.6	3.4	13.6	2.3	23.8	353
Man.	13.0	13.0	23.9	00.0	4.3	28.3	6.5	4.3	46
Sask.	21.7	5.8	20.3	00.0	4.3	14.5	4.3	24.6	69
Alta.	22.4	12.1	22.4	00.0	3.4	17.2	3.4	15.5	58
B.C.	55.0	8.3	10.0	1.7	1.7	3.3	3.3	16.7	120

An examination of the tables reveals that there are no very specific criticisms of unions. Nor are there any special differences between union and non-union members. They both tend to rank their criticisms in the same order. For example, both groups rank as first the criticism that unions demand "too much", secondly, that unions are "too prone to strike", thirdly, that unions are "too strong".

It is the regional variations in the total of critical remarks that are more interesting. The three prairie provinces are by far the most critical of unions since only 13% of Manitoban, 22% of Saskatchewan, and 22% of Alberta respondents offered no comment. Tolerance of unions was strongest in Quebec (78%), while British Columbians were next most tolerant (55%). The Quebec results are most surprising, given the purported anti-union bias of that Province. Finally, the ranking of criticisms is not significantly different among the provinces, with union "demands", "strength" and "proneness to strike" again singled out as the most serious flaws in unions.

The public, in general, also appears to think that there are "too many trouble makers and agitators among Union leaders." In March, 1954, 40.8% of those sampled (CIPO 235, N = 1861) agreed that there "are too many agitators", and in November, 1964, (CIPO 309), this proportion increased to 47.4%. In August, 1966, (CIPO 309), the proportions who accepted this as a fact of union life remained approximately the same at 42%.

These facts indicate that public opinion, as determined by the CIPQ, has hardened against union leaders. The general climate of opinion, while favouring unions, is highly critical of union leaders. Much of the criticism is directly related to a few unions whose leaders have dominated the news in recent years. Respondents who were critical of unions were asked to name the unions "you had in mind" when they criticized the unions. Of those replying, 23% named the Teamsters and/or Jimmy Hoffa, 15% singled out the Steel Workers, Railway Unions were mentioned by 6%, miners 3.4%, auto workers 2.7%. Another 8.4% condemned the C.I.O. and C.L.C. (1.6%) rather than a specific union, while 8.0% named the I.W.A. Another group (16%) damned "all of them" unions. Some 20% could name no unions. It is the large industrial and service unions which are most criticized. This is not unexpected because these unions are also the most visible ones. That is, when they go on strike they disrupt the lives of many citizens.

This is not to imply that the public has any coherent or systematic critical philosophy of unions. In the few instances when the CIPQ attempted to probe for specific criticisms of labour unions the following concepts were proffered by the public to explain their criticisms - calling of strikes, dictatorial leadership, excessive power, excessive agitation and demands, and rackets. Even so, none of these criticisms is held by a significant number of the public; they remain vague predispositions.

Table 6CRITICISMS OF LABOUR UNIONS

	March 1957 CIP0 <u>256</u>	June 1958 CIP0 <u>268</u>	January 1961 CIP0 <u>286</u>
Strikes	6.0	20.2	9.8
Dictatorial Leadership	4.1	14.7	9.4
Excessive Power	6.4	12.3	13.3
Excessive Agitation and Demands	8.4	19.4	9.4 +9.9
Rackets	3.4	-	4.3
No criticism	20.0	-	15.8
Other	6.4	6.7	
No Opinion	<u>45.3</u>	<u>26.7</u>	<u>13.2</u>
	N = 2109	N = 1203	N = 727

Because of these criticisms, a significant portion (around 30%) of the public feels that "laws regulating labour unions are not strict enough" (37.6%) (See CIP0 291, September, 1961, N = 676). Only 11.4% thought the laws were too strict.

Table 7
CIPQ 291

ARE THE LAWS REGULATING LABOUR UNIONS
TOO STRICT OR NOT STRICT ENOUGH?

	<u>Too Strict</u>	<u>Not strict enough</u>	<u>About right</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.E.I.	7.4	74.1	18.5	27
N.S.	00.0	60.0	40.0	5
N.B.	16.7	66.7	16.7	6
Que.	18.5	29.8	51.7	151
Ont.	15.2	56.2	28.7	178
Man.	14.3	67.9	17.9	28
Sask.	8.3	66.7	25.0	24
Alta.	26.1	60.9	13.0	23
B.C.	12.7	52.7	34.5	55
	<u>Too Strict</u>	<u>Not strict enough</u>	<u>About right</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	18.8	37.0	44.2	138
Non union member	13.9	55.3	30.8	367
	<u>Too Strict</u>	<u>Not strict enough</u>	<u>About right</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	5.3	63.2	31.6	19
Ave.+	14.4	51.9	33.7	106
Ave.	16.5	47.6	35.9	315
Poor	13.4	56.7	29.9	67

There appears to be no significant variation among regions, union/non-union respondents, or socio economic class, to explain public opinion with respect to the degree of strictness of laws regulating labour unions. The only interesting regional difference is among those who felt that the laws were "about right." Here, once again, Quebec respondents were the most satisfied with present laws (52%), with Nova Scotians (40%, N of 5), and respondents from British Columbia (35%) next in rank order of satisfaction.

In 1966 (CIPQ 318), the public sampled again thought that laws regulating labour unions were not strict enough (32.7%), while 15.6% thought they were too strict; 22% regarded them as just right, while 29.7% were undecided.

Table 8

CIPQ 318

ARE THE LAWS REGULATING LABOUR UNIONS STRICT ENOUGH?

	<u>Too Strict</u>	<u>Not Strict Enough</u>	<u>About right</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.E.I.	21.4	57.1	21.4	14
N.S.	20.0	30.0	50.0	20
N.B.	16.7	66.7	16.7	6
Que.	28.3	37.0	34.6	127
Ont.	21.5	48.2	30.4	192
Man.	34.6	42.3	23.1	26
Sask.	14.3	46.4	39.3	28
Alta.	6.7	76.7	16.7	30
B.C.	14.3	50.0	31.2	48

Table 8ARE THE LAWS REGULATING LABOUR UNIONS STRICT ENOUGH?

	<u>Too Strict</u>	<u>Not Strict Enough</u>	<u>About right</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	27.6	33.7	38.7	163
Non union member	19.6	52.9	27.5	327
	<u>Too Strict</u>	<u>Not Strict Enough</u>	<u>About right</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	13.3	73.3	13.3	15
Ave.+	19.6	45.8	34.6	107
Ave.	23.8	46.2	30.0	290
Poor	21.8	43.6	34.6	78

The same 1966 sample (CIPO 318) were also asked to assess the strictness of laws for business activity. Their replies indicate that they were just as unhappy with the weakness of laws regulating business as they were with laws regulating labour unions! See Table 9 below, 3rd column.

Table 9

ARE LAWS REGULATING LABOUR UNIONS/BUSINESS
TOO STRICT OR NOT STRICT ENOUGH?

	<u>September 1961 CIPO 291 Unions</u>	<u>CIPO 318 Unions</u>	<u>CIPO 318 Business</u>
Too Strict	11.4	15.6	9.5
Not Strict Enough	37.6	32.7	33.9
About Right	25.7	22.0	26.3
Undecided	25.3	29.7	30.4

Incredibly, there was absolutely no difference in the attitude of union and non-union respondents with respect to the strictness of laws regulating business! See Table 10 below.

Table 10

ARE THE LAWS REGULATING BUSINESS STRICT ENOUGH?

	<u>Too Strict</u>	<u>Not Strict Enough</u>	<u>About Right</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	14.4	46.9	38.7	160
Non Union member	13.2	49.5	37.2	325

When we investigate in more detail this public distrust of union activity, it is important to know what objects of union/labour activity the public accepts as legitimate. It will be seen that it is the style of labour/management negotiations that upsets the public and not the objects of labour activity. For example, the public is very well disposed toward higher wages for labour in general. The data is presented in Table 11 below. It can be seen that most of those sampled favour increased wages. In 1963 the margin was almost 2 to 1 in favour of higher wages, but in 1966 the margin in favour had increased to 3 to 1!

Table 11.IS LABOUR ENTITLED TO HIGHER WAGES?

	August 1963 <u>CIPO 304</u>	June 1966 <u>CIPO 319</u>	August 1966 <u>CIPO 320</u>
Yes, entitled	49.6	41.6	60.7
Some entitled	28.5	33.8	
Not entitled	16.3	13.7	20.0
Undecided	5.7	10.9	18.3
	N = 720	N = 671	N = 732

Once again, union and non-union members do not differ greatly in the degree of their approval for high wage demands. Union members support these demands by a clear majority of 57%, with non-union respondents slightly less approving at 42%. These two groups have their strongest difference at the "NO" end of the scale of preference, with only 6% of union members opposed to high wage demands, while 20% of non-union respondents opposed them.

When the replies are analyzed by socio economic class we have a strong correlation. That is, the higher status of the group the less likely it is to support the high wage demands. See Table 12 below.

Table 12

IS LABOUR ENTITLED OR NOT ENTITLED
TO THE HIGH WAGES THEY DEMAND?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Partly</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.S.I.	00.0	00.0	00.0	0
...	71.4	28.6	00.0	14
P.O.	100.0	00.0	00.0	7
...	41.3	52.1	6.6	167
Ont.	47.4	34.2	18.4	220
For.	77.8	18.5	3.7	27
...	38.0	30.0	32.0	50
...	46.3	31.5	12.2	41
...	40.6	32.8	26.6	64
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Partly</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	56.7	37.4	5.9	203
Non union member	41.5	38.2	20.3	395
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Partly</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	25.9	37.0	37.0	27
Ave +	44.1	37.5	18.4	152
Ave	47.0	40.2	12.8	336
Poo	56.6	30.1	13.3	83

Table 13

	O c t o b e r - 1 9 5 6		J u n e - 1 9 5 8		J a n u a r y - 1 9 6 1	
	CIPQ 252 Not press for	CIPQ 252 Most important	CIPQ 268 Not press for	CIPQ 286 Not press for	CIPQ 286 Not press for	CIPQ 286 Most important
Higher wages	35.2	11.9	38.8	45.4	8.8	
Better working conditions	3.3	17.8	2.6	5.1	15.0	
Shorter working hours	34.6	3.7	30.3	38.5	5.1	
Security of employment	2.4	39.2	2.3	1.7	55.7	
Better pension plans	2.7	12.7	2.3	4.1	16.6	
Profit sharing	9.3	7.4	12.0	12.0	11.3	
Other	0.6	0.6	1.5	0.6	0.7	
No opinion	16.9	8.0	21.4	15.5	5.0	

N = 2040

N=1203

N = 727

This is not to say that the public regards higher wages as the most important object of labour activity. In a series of questions begun in 1956, the CIP0 asked samples of the Canadian public to state first, what labour should not press for from employers. Higher wages (35.2%), and shorter working hours (34.6%) were most often cited as undesirable objectives in every instance. However, when asked to state what was the most important object, security of employment always was cited as the most important (39.2% in 1956, and 55.7% in 1961). See Table 13 above.

Some of these objects of labour activity have been investigated more thoroughly than others. For example, there is extensive research on public opinion on the desirability of shortening the work week.

The desirable number of hours in a work week has been tested from time to time, with conflicting findings. In March, 1956, a sample of the Canadian public was asked their opinion about a proposal "to establish a thirty hour week in industry to spread work among more people." Thirty four per cent were in favour of thirty hour week, while 57% rejected it in favour of a longer work week (9% had no opinion) (CIP0 247, question 14a). Sixty nine percent of those who rejected the thirty hour week opted for a forty hour week. This same reluctance to see the "work week in most industries reduced from forty hours to thirty five hours" was indicated in

a sample taken in May, 1957 (CIP0 257), when 26% favoured a reduction, 62% rejected, and 12% had no opinion.

Table 14

CIP0 257

SHOULD THE WORK WEEK BE REDUCED TO 35 HOURS?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	43.8	56.2	491
Non union member	23.7	76.3	1137
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	18.9	81.1	37
Ave +	22.7	77.3	392
Ave	31.7	68.3	880
Poor	36.3	63.7	215

On the question of a reduced work week there are strong differences of opinion between union and non-union members. Union members who support a shorter work week do so at a rate twice that of non-union members, but even so less than a majority (44%) of union members support a reduced work week. Here again social class is significant in explaining differences in opinion. Only 19% of the highest socio-economic class supported a reduced work week. Support for reduced hours increases with lower class level. But overall, there is not

much support for a reduction in hours. It would appear that the Protestant ethic still permeates Canadian society. However, there was strong support for the suggestion that should the work week be cut to thirty five hours, pay should not be cut, i.e., people should be paid for forty hours (83% for same pay, 9% for thirty five hours pay, 3% no opinion). By June, 1962, there had been no appreciable shift in favour of reduction of the work week, with only 28% in favour and 55% against, with 13% having no opinion.

Table 15

CIPQ 257

SHOULD PAY BE THE SAME FOR 35 as 40 HOURS?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	91.4	8.6	221
Non union member	74.9	25.1	319
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	50.0	50.0	6
Ave +	71.3	28.7	122
Ave	85.3	14.7	306
Poor	88.6	11.3	70

An analysis of the replies to the question of equal pay for reduced hours would indicate that with such strong support

for equal pay for reduced hours among union members (91%), that union leaders would have no difficulty in lining up membership support for such a policy. Any endorsement of an opposite view would probably be strongly resisted by unions. The only group in society (statistically insignificant in this sample, $N = 6$) that is evenly divided in the opinion is that group at the upper end of the socio-economic scale.

Other samples of the public have been queried about another method of reducing the work week. In January, 1959, and March, 1961, samples were asked: "Some labour leaders are suggesting that workers should work for a four day week - that is, four days of eight hours each. Would you like to see such a plan adopted by most industries in the country?"

Although less than one-third of those polled approved of this work schedule, it appears that there was some confusion with the question, because when they were asked whether the 32 hour week should bring in the same payments slightly over 50% agreed. Again union and non-union members were sharply divided with union members twice as likely to support the 32 hour week as non-union individuals. Even so, it is interesting to note that more union respondents (54%) in 1961 oppose a 4 day work week than support the suggestion. There is evidence in the tables below that indicates that this is a class question, with the highest socio-economic groups (95%) in 1959 most likely to oppose this type of work week.

Table 16CIP0 273SHOULD INDUSTRIES ADOPT A 4 DAY 8 HOUR WORK WEEK?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	46.4	53.6	168
Non Union- Member	26.4	73.6	474

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	5.6	94.4	18
Ave +	21.3	78.7	155
Ave	35.2	64.7	400
Poor	40.6	59.4	69

Table 17CIP0 287SHOULD A 4 DAY WORK WEEK BE ADOPTED?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	42.7	57.3	150
Non Union- Member	23.8	76.2	499

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	11.5	88.5	26
Ave +	17.2	82.8	151
Ave	31.5	68.5	397
Poor	38.7	61.3	75

Table 18

	January 1959 CIP0 273	March 1961 CIP0 287	At same pay 1959	At same pay 1961
Yes	29.7	26.0	53.7	53.4
No	64.0	66.3	41.0	42.0
No opinion	6.3	7.7	5.2	4.5
Total %	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.9

GUARANTEED ANNUAL WAGE

In September, 1955, a sample was asked: "Unions in certain industries are demanding a guaranteed annual wage whereby a union member would be paid by the company on a yearly basis, even if he was laid off. Do you think this would be a good thing for Canada as a whole, or not a good thing?" Forty five percent ~~liked~~ the idea, 36% rejected it, and 18% had no opinion. Those who thought it was a "good thing" were asked to state the proportion of the steadily employed salary that should be guaranteed. Eleven percent supported one third, 43%, a half, 37% more than a half, 3% stated other proportions, and 4.3% didn't know (CIP0 244). It would appear that although there is some support for the idea of a guaranteed annual wage, many of those who do support it have no conception of what it entails. This would be true particularly for those 43% who suggest a guarantee of one-half of the salary.

UNEMPLOYMENT

It is axiomatic that Canadian social scientists, journalists, and practicing politicians, will agree that there are great regional differences in public opinion. They are also in agreement that provincial governments, because of their size and history, are almost equal to the federal in public consciousness. If this argument holds true, then we would expect to see these differences reflected in variations in the replies to questions concerning the relative roles of various levels of government in Canada.

However, the data do not support this myth, with one exception, Quebec. Regardless of how the data is controlled, whether by province, socio-economic status, or membership in a union, the Canadian public is remarkably alike in its views on the role of two of the three main levels of government in Canada. Moreover, the public, despite the theories of Maritime Western Canadian separatism promoted by sooth-sayers, looks to the federal government to provide leadership in the area of unemployment. For example, in December, 1963, a sample was asked: "As you perhaps know, there is quite a bit of unemployment just now. Which level of Government do you feel should take the main responsibility for tackling this problem - municipal, provincial, or federal?" (CIP0 263, question 8a, N = 2233). The replies were: municipal 6%; provincial 15%; Federal 39%;

all three levels equally 33%; none 0.6%; can't say 12%. This question is broken down for examination in the tables below.

Table 19
CIFO 263

LEVEL OF GOV'T TO SOLVE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

	<u>Municipal</u>	<u>Provincial</u>	<u>Federal</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	7.1	15.2	38.9	38.2	0.6	519
Non Union- Member	4.5	16.1	42.8	36.0	0.7	1339
	<u>Municipal</u>	<u>Provincial</u>	<u>Federal</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	4.7	27.9	44.2	18.6	4.7	43
Ave +	5.6	17.6	45.9	29.7	1.2	427
Ave	4.7	15.1	41.2	38.5	.4	1191
Poor	7.1	13.5	35.3	44.1	0.0	170
	<u>Municipal</u>	<u>Provincial</u>	<u>Federal</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.E.I.	5.0	15.0	55.0	25.0	00.0	20
N.S.	5.6	15.0	42.1	37.4	00.0	107
N.B.	10.4	18.7	39.6	31.2	00.0	48
Que.	5.7	16.3	22.2	54.8	.9	454
Ont.	6.5	16.1	43.7	33.2	.6	666
Man.	2.7	9.7	48.7	38.9	00.0	113
Sask.	5.0	13.0	72.0	10.0	00.0	100
Alta.	3.7	19.9	39.7	33.8	2.9	136
B.C.	1.5	17.9	60.2	20.4	00.0	196

An examination of the last table above, shows that the only significant deviation from the tendency to look to the federal government for responsibility in the area of unemployment are the people from Quebec. But the low support for federal activity in Québec is masked by the large proportion of the Quebec sample (55%) who opt for the ambiguous reply "All" levels of government are responsible for ending unemployment.

This general agreement on the level of government responsible for solving unemployment, breaks down, however, when the adequacy of measures being taken are questioned. Here social class and regionalism lead to divergencies of opinion. For example, when asked whether they felt that the "steps being taken by our various governments to tackle this problem are adequate or inadequate", the same sample split, adequate 23%, inadequate 55%, no opinion 21%.

Table 20

CIPQ 263

ARE ADEQUATE STEPS BEING TAKEN TO SOLVE UNEMPLOYMENT?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	25.5	74.5	470
Non union member	31.2	68.8	1186
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	41.2	58.8	34
Ave +	35.1	64.9	362
Ave	28.0	72.0	1079
Poor	21.0	79.0	157

Table 20CIPO 263ARE ADEQUATE STEPS BEING TAKEN TO SOLVE UNEMPLOYMENT?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.E.I.	76.5	23.5	17
N.S.	40.2	59.8	87
N.B.	47.4	52.6	38
Que.	21.5	78.5	410
Ont.	35.5	64.5	586
Man.	30.3	69.7	109
Sask.	33.3	66.7	102
Alta.	14.0	86.0	114
B.C.	19.8	80.2	172

The same level of dissatisfaction with Federal Government endeavours was indicated by another sample in May, 1961 (CIPO 288, question 14a, N = 692), of whom 30% felt it was adequate, 54% inadequate, and 12% no opinion. Much the same socio-economic and regional differences were evidenced as in the previous sample.

Those who felt the Federal Government was not doing enough "to help solve the unemployment situation" were asked to state "What more do you think they should be doing?" The largest proportion (21%) suggested the old panacea of more public works; another 15% wanted protection of jobs by (a) keeping out foreign goods (7.3%) and (b) restricting immigration (7.6%).

Ten percent suggested the creation of new industries, 8% to open up the north; 5% attacked automation, whereas only 4% supported more sophisticated economic/social measures such as increasing education and training, and reorganizing finances in order to enable the government to spend more money (10%). Fifteen percent made no suggestions.

It would appear, then, that the public looks to the Federal Government, especially, for solutions to unemployment; is critical of the Government's efforts; but can only suggest stop-gap measures. (See also CIPQ 283, July, 1960, Question 14, for similar stop-gap suggestions.) This dependence on Government initiative is a long-standing one in Canada. For example, in July, 1954 (CIPQ 237), when asked "Do you think business firms in this country will be able to provide enough jobs for everyone during the next five years, or will the Government have to step in and provide work?", only 21% thought business firms could provide enough jobs, whereas 65% looked to the Government to step in (14% were undecided).

Table 21

CIPQ 237

WILL GOV'T HAVE TO HELP PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT?

	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	20.3	79.7	413
Non Union-Member	26.1	73.9	1117

Table 21CIPO 237WILL GOV'T HAVE TO HELP PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT?

	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	34.5	65.5	87
Ave +	32.2	67.8	245
Ave	27.2	72.8	577
Poor +	15.5	84.5	433
Poor	15.6	84.4	211
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.E.I.	00.0	100.0	9
N.S.	27.3	72.7	44
N.B.	12.0	88.0	25
Que.	14.9	85.1	478
Ont.	35.2	64.8	497
Man.	33.3	66.7	96
Sask.	18.7	81.3	91
Alta.	16.0	84.0	119
B.C.	29.1	70.9	158

For some inexplicable reason there was no sharp division of opinion between union members and non-union citizens about the necessity of government action to provide jobs. However, there was a sharp difference among citizens when social class is considered. Here, those at the lowest end of the scale were quite persuaded (84%) that the government would have to

provide employment, while those at the other end of the scale gave only 66% support of the idea.

There is additional evidence that the public tends to look toward government leadership in the area of economic development. For example, when asked to evaluate the relative success of various leaders in improving living standards, more (31%) named government leaders than any other group. Opinion was evenly divided on the role of labour leaders (25%), and businessmen (25%).

Union members cited labour leaders (45%) as having done the most, then government (30%), and finally businessmen (22%), while non-union members cited government first (40%), businessmen second (32%), and finally union leaders (25%). It is obvious that there is a sharp difference of opinion here between union and non-union respondents, and this difference on the relative roles of labour, business and government perhaps underlies the ambivalence of the public with respect to responsibility for the improvement of living standards in Canada.

Again, in May, 1956 (CIP0 248, question 8), 31.3% of a sample thought that leaders in government "had done the most to improve the living standards of the people in (Canada)", whereas 25.2% credited this to leaders in labour unions, and only 25% to business. Sixteen percent had no opinion.

Table 22

GIPO 248

WHICH LEADERS HAVE DONE MOST TO IMPROVE
THE CANADIAN STANDARD OF LIVING

	<u>Labour Unions</u>	<u>Gov't.</u>	<u>Business</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union member	45.4	30.4	21.6	2.6	273
Non Union- member	25.4	39.8	32.2	2.6	887
	<u>Labour Unions</u>	<u>Gov't.</u>	<u>Business</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	15.6	68.7	15.6	00.0	32
Ave +	29.6	36.5	28.8	5.0	260
Ave	30.5	35.0	32.6	1.9	694
Poor	31.4	42.9	23.4	2.3	175
	<u>Labour Unions</u>	<u>Gov't.</u>	<u>Business</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.E.I.	28.6	47.6	19.0	4.8	21
N.S.	46.3	42.6	11.1	00.0	54
N.B.	16.7	26.7	56.7	00.0	30
Que.	22.4	46.6	30.0	1.0	290
Ont.	37.9	28.8	28.8	4.6	393
Man.	25.9	29.6	44.4	00.0	54
Sask.	20.5	43.8	35.6	00.0	73
Alta.	17.9	44.6	33.9	3.6	112
B.C.	36.4	37.2	23.1	3.3	121

The public is also divided in its opinion about the relative weight of influence of various segments of the social

system. For example, the respondents of a survey conducted in May, 1960 (CIP0 282, question 9), stated that capitalists, industrialists, and big business (23%), and the rich, upper class (19.0%) were the groups in the population getting the most out of the current prosperity, whereas only 9.3% thought labour was benefiting most. Farmers were mentioned by 0.8%, the middle class 9.4%, professional groups 7.3%, business men 4.7%, government and politicians 4.8%, other 6.3%. Some 3.7% thought all groups were doing well, while only 10.5% had no opinion.

Table 23
CIP0 282

WHICH GROUP GETTING MOST OUT OF PRESENT PROSPERITY

	Big Business	Rich Labourers		Far- mers	Ave. Per- son	Educ- ated Person	Bus. Men	Poli- ticians
P.E.I.	34.0	34.0	3.8	00.0	13.2	5.7	7.5	1.9
N.S.	57.1	7.1	7.1	00.0	7.1	7.1	7.1	00.0
N.B.	00.0	42.9	00.0	00.0	14.3	00.0	35.7	7.1
Que.	18.9	30.5	8.5	1.2	12.2	17.1	3.0	6.1
Ont.	26.1	18.9	17.2	1.7	13.3	7.2	7.8	6.7
Man.	27.3	42.2	9.1	00.0	18.2	3.0	00.0	00.0
Sask.	26.9	15.4	26.9	00.0	3.8	7.7	3.8	3.8
Alta.	67.5	5.0	5.0	00.0	5.0	2.5	2.5	5.0
B.C.	35.6	20.0	11.1	00.0	6.7	8.9	4.4	13.3
Totals	163	138	65	5	66	53	33	33

Table 23

CIP0 282WHICH GROUP GETTING MOST OUT OF PRESENT PROSPERITY?

	<u>Big Busi- ness</u>	<u>Rich</u>	<u>Labour- ers</u>	<u>Far- mers</u>	<u>Ave. Per- son</u>	<u>Educ- ated Person</u>	<u>Bus. Men</u>	<u>Polli- ticians</u>	<u>No Prosper- ity</u>
Union Member	28.9	31.0	7.0	00.0	7.7	9.2	6.3	7.7	2.1
Non Union Member	28.3	21.8	13.3	1.1	13.3	9.2	5.5	5.1	2.3
Totals	164	139	68	5	69	53	33	33	13

	<u>Big Busi- ness</u>	<u>Rich</u>	<u>Labour- ers</u>	<u>Far- mers</u>	<u>Ave. Per- son</u>	<u>Educ- ated Person</u>	<u>Bus. Men</u>	<u>Polli- ticians</u>	<u>No Prosper- ity</u>
Wealthy	30.4	4.3	21.7	4.3	21.7	00.0	4.3	8.7	4.3
Ave +	26.3	12.7	19.5	1.7	11.0	16.1	6.8	4.2	1.7
Ave	28.4	27.5	9.2	0.3	11.5	8.3	6.5	5.6	2.7
Poor	30.6	30.6	9.2	1.0	12.2	6.1	2.0	7.1	1.0
Totals	164	139	68	5	69	53	33	33	13

A question asked in 1955 indicates what groups the public thinks have the most influence on the Federal Government, and also what groups the public thinks should have the most influence.

Table 24
WHAT GROUPS HAVE
AND SHOULD HAVE
MOST INFLUENCE IN OTTAWA

	<u>September, 1955</u> <u>CITO 2/4</u>	
	<u>Has</u>	<u>Should Have</u>
Labour Unions	30.6	26.1
Veterans Groups	5.9	8.5
Large Companies	37.5	4.7
Farmers' Organizations	8.7	17.5
Others	1.0	2.5
None	--	24.3
DK	16.0	10.0
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total %	99.7	100.5

In other polls, only labour and big business were compared as to which "has the most influence on the laws passed in this country." In these polls Big Business does not fare well and appears to be more criticized than unions. However, the choice of wording is unfortunate. One wonders whether the results would have differed had the question been "Big Labour Unions" and "Big Business".

Table 25

	<u>January, 1960</u> <u>CIPO 280</u>		<u>February, 1964</u> <u>CIPO 306</u>
	<u>Has</u>	<u>Should Have</u>	<u>Has</u>
Big Business	58.2	20.2	52.3
Labour	23.3	38.6	26.1
No Difference	6.5		
Other		27.2	9.7
Undecided	12.1	14.0	12.0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total %	100.1	100.0	100.1

INFLATION

An area of great concern to governments and the public is that of inflation and high prices. Regardless of which segment(s) of the economy are to blame, it is of some interest to note that the public apportions blame for high prices to many segments, rather than any single one. For example, in August, 1951 (CIPO 212, N = 1945), when asked "Where do you place the blame for present high prices in Canada?", the sample apportioned blame in the following way:

Table 26

BLAME FOR PRESENT HIGH PRICES
IN CANADA

Government	24.9%
Manufacturers, big business	11.4
Individual greed - everyone - consumers	3.9
Present world conditions	5.3
Labour demands	16.0
Middle men	3.9
The removal or lack of control	10.0
High costs	.5
Supply and demand	1.6
No blame	3.6
Don't know	22.2
Miscellaneous	10.8

Once again, it the government which is singled out by more respondents as the main agent in affecting the living conditions of Canadians. Just as the government is expected to sustain employment, so too it is the government which is likely to be held responsible for high prices. Both labour and business get some share of the blame, but it is less than that placed on the shoulders of government.

There is some evidence that the public believes that prices are kept up by monopolies and combines. In

March, 1956 (CIP0 247, N = 2293), 56% agreed, 14% disagreed, and 30% had no opinion, that monopolies and combines keep up prices. Those who agreed suggested that the worst offenders were in food and groceries (34%), 14% automobiles and parts (except tires), 15% metals or machinery and parts, 4% drugs or cosmetics, 10% rubber-tire industry, lumber and paper 8%, farm produce 4%, textiles 5%, electrical appliances 10%, while 11% thought monopolies existed for most things they had to buy. Twenty two percent mentioned other products as well, while only 7% had no answer.

An examination of the items listed in the last paragraph would indicate that for most individuals it is the price of food and automobiles that cause the greatest concern. Together these two items account for over 50% of the criticism of monopolies. This finding is not unexpected given the importance of these items in the economy.

A comparative analysis over time of public opinion on the causes of high prices shows the following: When asked "Do you think that the main cause of high prices in Canada is high wages, high profits or some other cause?", various samples have replied:

CAUSES OF HIGH PRICES

	<u>CIPQ 260</u>	<u>CIPQ 314</u>	<u>CIPQ 315</u>
High Wages	14.0	23.4	32.1
Big Profits	17.6	44.5	39.0
Both	14.9	--	--
Other	2.3	14.8	13.1
Can't Say	3.7	17.9	18.4
Reject	42.5	3.2	
		N = 1763	N = 1973

Once again, more of those sampled blame the activities of business than unions for the ills of society. For example, High Profits are more likely to be singled out than are high wages as a cause of high prices. For some strange reason there is virtually no disagreement between members of unions and the general public in this matter.

Unfortunately, there is no series of questions over time concerning the relationship between prices and wages, but in the one instance when the public was queried, 38% felt that their wages had not kept pace with price increases between the year 1946 and 1957, only 15% thought that they had kept up, while 44% couldn't tell. (CIPQ 260, September 1957, question 3(e), N = 2,000).

Again, there are no significant differences among

those sampled, regardless of whether unionism, social class or region was controlled.

There are many remedies that could be suggested to control inflation. One remedy is to freeze wages and prices. This rather drastic proposal received strong support among those sampled. For example, in 1951 (CIP0 213, question 1(a), N = 1804), 43% of those sampled thought that both prices and wages should be frozen, 9% thought it was a fair idea, 30% rejected the idea, 6% gave qualified answers, and 11% couldn't say what they thought of the suggestion. These results would suggest that the public would support, in the short run, massive government control over the economy.

This conclusion is not surprising when one examines, over time, just what the public has thought was "the most important problem facing this country today?" Several areas are constant. These are: employment, rent and cost of living, and external affairs. [See the detailed list in the following table]. So pervasive is this concern over employment and cost of living that both are cited even when people are asked "what is the greatest problem facing you and your family at the present time?" This is shown in the table on page 43.

TABLE 28

QUESTION: WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION IS THE MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM FACING THIS COUNTRY TODAY?

	June 1949 CIPO 187	June 1949 CIPO 186	Aug. 1951 CIPO 212	July 1954 CIPO 227	Dec. 1957 CIPO 263	July 1959 CIPO 276	July 1960 CIPO 283	May 1962 CIPO 295	June 1962 CIPO 296	Mar. 1963 CIPO 301	Aug. 1963 CIPO 304	Aug. 1964 CIPO 308	Oct. 1964 CIPO 314
Trade - Improve markets	6.8	7.1	0.6	6.5	5.8	1.9	1.9	3.3	4.3	1.0	1.7	11.9	0.6
Income Tax	6.0	7.1	4.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Social Security	8.2	1.7	7.3	0.4	0.4	7.7	—	1.5	1.3	—	5.8	2.8	5.7
Employment	15.3	10.4	1.5	32.5	40.9	40.4	40.1	48.5	47.4	34.5	38.1	31.9	14.4
Foreign Relations	3.1	14.8	1.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	17.4	13.4	2.8	5.1
Rent Controls	10.4	3.0	38.8	4.4	4.4	5.3	5.6	6.2	9.9	9.1	7.4	2.9	—
Cost of Living	3.0	0.0	0.5	3.7	—	3.7	1.9	—	—	—	1.3	—	0.9
Labour - Strikes	2.4	2.6	1.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Roads - Transportation	20.0	19.1	5.0	2.4	1.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Housing	0.2	8.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Freight Rates	2.6	2.1	5.2	—	5.8	3.5	2.1	1.5	—	0.8	—	—	1.6
Farm Problems	—	—	11.8	9.5	8.3	13.5	23.8	5.0	7.6	2.4	—	6.5	—
War	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Quebec	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.6	11.4	7.3
No Opinion	—	—	25.4	16.4	16.8	9.3	5.3	14.9	17.3	15.4	12.6	17.7	25.2

WHAT WOULD YOU SAY IS THE GREATEST PROBLEM
FACING YOU AND YOUR FAMILY AT THE PRESENT TIME?

	Nov. 1955 CIPQ <u>245</u>	March 1958 CIPQ <u>267</u>	Nov. 1959 CIPQ <u>279</u>	Aug. 1964 CIPQ <u>308</u>
Money	41.9	30.3	—	17.7
War	0.6	—	3.4	1.7
Taxes	1.3	—	—	4.7
Housing	7.2	5.3	5.2	—
Domestic	8.2	—	—	—
Employment	4.3	10.9	16.8	3.7
Health	7.6	8.4	8.7	3.0
Old age insecurity	1.9	2.7	—	—
Business problems	5.8	5.8	—	—
Personal problems	2.2	2.9	2.5	5.5
No problem	13.0	20.7	19.7	—
Miscellaneous	4.7	5.8	4.7	5.0
Education	4.9	—	4.7	6.5
Cost of living	—	—	26.5	11.7
DK	—	—	7.9	41.0

STRIKES

Probably the issue which annoys bedevils public opinion about labour/union activity is the strike. The CIPQ has asked many questions of the public about this

issue, and the tactical use of pickets, injunctions, etc. To begin with, the "right to strike" has strong support, in general. In November, 1963 (CIP0 299, question 13(a), N = 705, 63.7% of those sampled supported the right to strike, 28.5% opposed, and 7.8% had no opinion.

Table 30

CIP0 299

SHOULD WORKERS HAVE THE RIGHT TO STRIKE?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.E.I.	63.6	36.4	33
N.S.	84.2	15.8	19
N.B.	87.5	12.5	8
Que.	58.0	42.0	176
Ont.	72.0	28.0	232
Man.	69.4	30.6	36
Sask.	75.9	24.1	29
Alta.	76.7	23.3	43
B.C.	76.1	23.9	67
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union Member-	81.5	18.5	157
Non Union- member	65.1	34.9	493
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	78.0	22.0	41
Ave +	70.4	29.6	162
Ave	68.1	31.9	339
Poor	66.7	33.3	108

Analysis of the above tables indicates that the right to strike is strongly supported by union members (82%), while there is lesser support (65%) among non-union people. However, it is surprising to discover that the lower the social class the lower the support for the right to strike! It may be that the abstract concept of the "right to strike" is regarded as fundamental to democratic society, and so those who are most educated are also the most articulate about "rights". No doubt the upper socio-economic groups would argue the proposition in these terms.

However, only 45% of the same sample thought that the strike "has not outlived its usefulness as a means by which workers can press for their demands", whereas 38.3% of the same sample thought that the strike weapon had "outlived its usefulness"; 7.5% gave ambiguous answers, and 9.2% had no opinion.

The public, in 1966 (CIP0 320, August 1966, N = 732, questions 6(a) and 6(b)), did not support the principle of sympathy support by other unions in the picket line. Some 59.2% wanted the right of other unions to join picket lines restricted, only 23.8% supported sympathy picketing, 1.8% gave qualified answers, and 15.3% were undecided. However, strong support was given to the principle of court injunctions to restrict the numbers in a picket line. Some 54.4% approved of such court injunctions, only 24.6% disapproved of such court injunctions, 2.6% gave qualified answers and 18.4%

had no opinion.

The public has even indicated a willingness to support such drastic action as limiting the duration of a strike to 7 days! In January, 1966 (CIP0 317, N = 658, question 6), 72.9% favoured such a proposal. The question was: "It has been suggested that no strike be permitted to go on for more than seven days. If after seven days the union and the employer cannot reach an agreement, a government appointed committee would decide the issue and both be compelled to accept the terms." Only 19.3% opposed such compulsory arbitration, whereas 7.8% had no opinion.

Table 31

CIP0 317

LIMITING OF STRIKES TO SEVEN DAYS

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union Member	64.5	35.5	62
Non Union- Member	78.9	21.1	114
	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	28.3	71.7	127
Ave +	38.8	61.2	49
Ave	33.3	66.7	15
Poor	74.4	25.6	43

There was surprisingly strong support for this proposition even among union members (65%). It is obvious that

few people like lengthy strikes. One should have the right to strike, but not for long periods.

The public appears, also, to have calculus in mind of categories of employment in which the strike weapon would be restricted. For example, when asked in January, 1966, whether "workers in public utilities such as transportation, gas, hydro, and so on, should be allowed to strike or not", only 29.4% agreed to allow them to strike, 60.1% wished to prevent strikes in these categories, 1.6% gave qualified answers, and 8.9% had no opinion.

Those who supported the right to strike gave as their reasons that "everyone has the right to strike" (49.5%); "a strike is all right is justified - with proper bargaining" (20.3%); "a strike is their only weapon" (11.4%); "they have to uphold the union" (5.0%); "no particular reason" (1.5%); other reasons (1.0%). Those who opposed the right to strike cited these reasons: "the public suffers" (54.0%); "disrupts the country - raises the cost of living" (15.8%); "can settle it peacefully" (6.8%); "they are well paid, the more they get the more they want" (12.1%); "don't believe in strikes, or unions" (13.6%).

The public appears to be less concerned by strikes in such communications industries as newspapers, telephone, radio, and T.V. (CIP0 302, April 1963, N = 2625, question 8). But even here there is sharp disagreement on this issue between union and non-union members. See Table 32 below.

Table 32
CIPQ 302

ATTITUDE TOWARD COMMUNICATIONS STRIKE

	<u>Should be Forbidden</u>	<u>Should not be Forbidden</u>	<u>Total</u>
Union Member	21.9	78.1	398
Non Union member	41.8	58.2	691

There is more support for forbidding, by law, strikes in transportation industries such as railroads, airlines, buses, and shipping. However, preventing civil servants from striking, is less acceptable.

Table 33

STRIKES FORBIDDEN BY LAW

	<u>Communications</u>	<u>Transportation</u>	<u>Civil Service</u>
Should be	39.8	43.4	33.1
Should not	42.6	39.7	53.9
No Opinion	15.0	14.4	11.2
Reject	2.5	2.5	1.7
	<u>99.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>99.9</u>

We can summarize our findings on the issue of strikes in the following way. In general, there is not very strong support for the right to strike (64% in favour). This right is supported more strongly by union than non-union members, but even the union members level of support is only 82%.

There are strong regional variations in opinion on this issue, with lowest support in the province of Quebec, and highest in the Maritimes (with the exception of Prince Edward Island). The public would like to see some alternative to the strike weapon, or at least a drastic curtailment of the length of a strike. This proposition receives support even among a majority of union members.

PUBLIC OPINION AND REAL CASES

Let us now investigate public opinion when it is confronted with an actual strike. We will consider the extent of public awareness of the strike, and its reaction to various steps taken by those involved in the strike. For example, what was public opinion with regard to the action taken by the Federal Government with respect to the Seamen's International Union in 1963? In June, 1963, a sample of the public was queried about its knowledge of government activity (CIPO 303, N = 709, question 7(a) and 7(b)). Some 65.1% knew about the government action. Those who knew were asked "Do you approve or disapprove of the Government's action in setting up this Trusteeship?" Some 69.9% approved, 8.0% disapproved, 1.1% gave qualified answers, and 21.0% were undecided. This 70% support for the government's actions is not surprising in view of the general public's mandate to the government to

act. We have established that there is this general mandate here in Canada.

The public has also been asked for its opinion on other government actions. In the instance cited here, the area probed was government action on the railway dispute of 1954. On July 28, 1954 (CIP0 237, N = 1860, question 23(a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f)), the public was asked the following series of questions, and responded to each in the following way:

Question 23(a). Here are a group of questions about current railway disputes. Have you heard or read anything about them? Yes - 56.1%, No - 42.9%. This leads us to conclude that much of the public is unaware of basic issues facing the country. This is not surprising to social scientists.

Question 23(b). There has been some talk that the railway unions will call a strike to get "fringe" benefits such as holidays and sick pay for their members. Do you, or do you not, think the unions will actually call a strike to get these benefits? Yes - 39.4%, No - 22.7%, Qualified - 2.9%, No Opinion - 32.7%.

Question 23(d). And if the government permitted both higher wages and higher railway rates, do you think the cost of living, generally, would go up, or do you think that it would be unaffected? Go up - 58.3%, Unaffected - 21.1%, Don't know - 18.5%.

Question 23(e). If a strike boosted railway wages, do you think railways would have to lay off more men - or don't you think this would be necessary? Lay off men - 27.2%, Not lay off men - 36.9%, Qualified - 3.9%, Don't know - 30.0%.

Question 23(f). Perhaps you have read or heard that the Arbitration board disallowed the unions' demand for fringe benefits. Do you, or do you not, agree with their decisions? Agree with findings - 25.3%, Do not agree - 22.9%, Qualified - .4%, No Opinion - 49.1%.

It would appear that some parts of the public have a fairly sophisticated conception of the impact of strikes on the economy, particularly on the inflationary spiral, but they are confused, or at least, are unable to make up their minds as to whether arbitration settlements are satisfactory.

Public opinion, however, is somewhat fickle about the granting of wage increases. This can be illustrated from data on railway disputes during 1959, and 1960, when support for wage increases dropped from 41.9% in favour to 31.1%

POLL 278, September 1959 - Question 5(a): As you may know, in additor to actual train crews, many people work for the railways. Unions representing these non-operating employees are asking for wage increases this fall. Do you think these railway employees should or should not be given higher wages? Yes,--should get higher wages - 41.9%, No, should not - 31.4%, Qualified - 5.2%, No opinion - 21.5%.

Union members strongly supported higher wages (79%), as opposed to a negative response (52% against) by non-union respondents. Those in the highest socio-economic group were strongly oppose (80%) to higher wages for non-operating railway crews, but at least 40% in each of the other groups supported higher wages. We can see that union membership is the cutting edge when higher wages are at stake. However, a strong regional element is also present, for respondents from Saskatchewan, in particular, were strongly opposed to higher wages (71%). This is probably explained by Saskatchewan's heavy dependence on railways to move grain. Manitobans expressed the second highest rate of hostility (56%), while Albertans were third (51%).

Table 34
CIPQ 278

DO NON-OPERATING R.R. CREWS DESERVE HIGHER WAGES?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
P.E.I.	40.0	60.0	20
N.S.	75.0	25.0	8
N.B.	66.7	33.3	15
Que.	62.0	38.0	142
Ont.	58.0	42.0	169
Man.	44.4	55.6	36
Sask.	29.2	70.8	24
Alta.	48.6	51.4	35
B.C.	64.7	35.3	51

Table 35
CIPO 278

DO NON-OPERATING R.R. CREWS DESERVE HIGHER WAGES?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wealthy	20.0	80.0	10
Ave +	49.2	50.8	118
Ave	64.3	35.7	314
Poor	42.4	57.6	66

Conclusion

A survey of Canadian public opinion on industrial relations over the last two decades indicates that regionalism and whether an individual is or is not a member of a union are crucial determinants of public attitudes toward industrial relations. If this is so, and certainly the evidence presented in the previous pages supports this contention, then the task of government is made very difficult if it hopes to provide some uniformity in the handling of disputes.

There is one irreducible element in the picture. While the principle of labour unions is not questioned seriously, there is very strong dissatisfaction with the traditional methods such as strikes used to settle disputes. There is strong approval of government intervention in strikes, particularly intervention by the federal government. It would also appear that key communications media such as railroads and sea-ways are regarded as areas of special concern by the public. The public would like to see some alternative to the strike.

